

Proposal Reviews

#255: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

Woodbridge Irrigation District

Final Selection Panel Review

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Delta Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding #1
#2

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 255

Applicant Organization: Woodbridge Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

| | |
|------------------------------------|---|
| Fund | |
| As Is | - |
| In Part | - |
| With Conditions | - |
| Consider as Directed Action | - |
| Not Recommended | X |

Amount: \$0

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Selection Panel received many comments on this proposal. Most cited a previous investment of CALFED ERP funds in the design and permitting of the project, and the collaborative work of Woodbridge Irrigation District with the resource agencies as reasons for supporting funding the proposal in full or in part.

The Selection Panel is aware of this previous investment of CALFED ERP funds, and acknowledges the hard work of both the applicant and the resource agencies. The Selection Panel's initial recommendation was based on the Fish Screen and Ladder Construction Panel's assessment to not recommend funding now. Although the Delta Regional Panel ranked this proposal as "high", both the Fish Screen and Passage Tehnical Team and Delta Regional Panel cited total costs as an issue. Specifically, the Delta Regional Panel identified approximately \$12 million of costs as perhaps not providing benefits to the CALFED ERP.

The other issue identified by the Fish Screen and Passage Technical Team was the alternatives analysis. While the Selection Panel is not in a position to comment on these details, it appears that there are at least some questions related to the consideration of alternatives that need to be addressed before making this level of investment in a permanent, but fish-passable, barrier that will affect river ecosystem functions.

Given the unknowns regarding the alternatives analysis specifics, the high costs (in comparison to other CALFED ERP priorities for this year), and the inability to distinguish the CALFED ERP benefits from the total project costs, the Selection Panel does not recommend funding at this time. However, the Selection Panel recognizes the importance of addressing these passage issues, and recommends that the CALFED ERP staff meet directly with the project applicant to resolve the issues identified above and begin a discussion on how to move forward and build on the investment made to date.

Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Fish Screen and Passage Technical Review

Proposal Number: 255

Applicant Organization: Woodbridge Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

| Overall Evaluation Summary Rating | Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| -Superior | This project would be rated higher if the applicant contributed a significant cost-share portion of the project (on the order of 50%). Other, less costly options are available and should be explored. The technical team in reviewing this proposal suggested exploring restoring the river to its original channel to facilitate an on-river screen option at the head of the existing diversion channel which would provide better biological benefits at less cost. |
| -Above average | |
| -Adequate | |
| XNot recommended | |

1. **Location in terms of potential impact on fishery.** Is the project located where it will significantly benefit the fishery? Do current fish passage barriers or water diversions there harm large numbers of fish? What species of anadromous fish are present? Is the project located where these species are in their most vulnerable life stages? Will it benefit other species of fish or the waterway's community and ecosystem? Does it restore and protect natural habitats or habitat values? Will its benefits be long-term, or short-lived? Is its biological effectiveness clearly demonstrable?

Fall-run chinook salmon and steelhead trout use the existing fish passage facilities. Steelhead are listed as Threatened; the area is EFH for fall-run chinook. Out-migrants cresting the dam are stunned on rocks below the dam and are preyed upon by striped bass holding in a large pool under existing conditions. The proposed project will modify problem areas to increase survival; however, striped bass may gain access to the upper watershed due to passage improvements. Experts predict a net decrease in predation losses due to the proposed project. Benefits will be long term. Salmonids will not be in their MOST

vulnerable stage in the project area, but many fry-sized individuals would be saved by screen, dam, and ladder improvements.

Passage is currently possible through the existing ladder but is not ideal. The diversion is screened but inadequately, with a bypass system that may be harmful to fish. Fry are usually not present, but out-migrants may rear in the lake; all spawning habitat is upstream of the site, i.e. all out migrants must pass the dam. The proposed design provides the best fish passage conditions, but at a high cost.

2. **Diversions taking a greater proportion of flow.** If the project is a fish screen, is the size of the diversion to be screened a significant proportion of the waterway's discharge?

The diversion takes a significant portion of flow, sometimes leaving just tens of cfs in the river below the dam. The proposed screen bypass system includes a trap for collecting out-migrants under lowest flows and transporting them to the bay.

3. **Implementability** (minimal legal, regulatory or technical obstacles): Does the project use proven and existing technology, or unproven and experimental technology? Can it be implemented in a timely fashion, or are protracted delays anticipated? Are project partners, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Will legal, regulatory, or technical obstacles impede it? Can any adverse effects be reversed or adequately mitigated? Does it enjoy public support? Is it compatible with other programs and projects, which are part of an integrated restoration program for the waterway? Does it have synergistic effects with ongoing programs?

Technology proposed is proven and in service at many other locations. I see no problems with scheduling the implementation of the project. Contractors have not yet been chosen, but there are contractors around capable of completing the work. The project applicant has been working with state and federal agencies, as well as local groups to avoid conflict; the proposed design is satisfactory to all parties involved. The public is very much for the project as it will preserve their recreational and aesthetic interests. The proposed project is compatible with existing gravel replenishment programs, and EBMUDs fish monitoring work.

4. **Cost/Benefit Comments.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Cost for the project is very high. There are less costly solutions that can provide better biological benefits.

5. **Partnerships/Opportunities.** Does the project fully involve appropriate partners? Are the applicants willing participants? Are other cost-sharing funds available, and fully exploited?

The applicant is a willing participant and has much to gain from the project. The irrigation district, EBMUD, and the City of Lodi have contributed a combined total of \$600,000 to the project, which is slightly less than 2% of the amount requested for phases 2 and 3.

6. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

Regional review panel ranked the project HIGH. They identified benefits similar to those listed in miscellaneous comments below.

7. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

No significant concerns.

Miscellaneous comments:

The project applicant has worked tirelessly with state and federal agencies to develop a design that will meet the needs of all parties: the system capacity will not prevent the irrigation district from taking their entitled water right; the City of Lodi will be able to maintain their parks lake elevation at the prescribed value; riverside land owners will not have their yards flooded by high reservoir elevations in summer time; out-migrating fish will be able to follow the rivers current to the dam when the low level fish screen is in use; a significant predation problem should be eliminated; the existing screens bypass system does not facilitate timely passage due to poor entrance conditions, small pipe diameter, and floating debris; and adult migrating fish will gain easier passage.

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 255

Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This project resolves long-standing fish passage concerns. It is the result of extensive discussion + negotiation between the WID + resource agencies.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Project is feasible. Applicant team is highly qualified and experienced. Proposed design is result of extensive negotiations/discussions with National Marine Fisheries Service, California Department of Fish and Game, US Fish and Wildlife Service and East Bay Municipal Utility District fisheries experts and incorporates the recommendations of NMFS and CDFG fish passage engineers. Project enjoys nearly unanimous support of local residents. Environmental documentation process is nearly complete (awaiting Biological Opinions).

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Fish passage elements of project directly address Strategic goals 1 (at-risk species) and 3 (harvestable species) by facilitating passage of resident and anadromous fish to upstream spawning grounds or to downstream rearing areas. The fish viewing building would also provide environmental educational opportunities.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Project facilitates implementation of fishery flow and other provisions of FERC Joint Settlement Agreement 2916 for continued operation of Pardee and Camanche dams (EBMUD); complements Mokelumne hatchery expansion now underway; complements CVPIA-funded gravel enhancement projects within the 9-mile spawning reach downstream of Camanche Dam; complements Calfed-funded Lower Mokelumne Watershed Partnership

riparian restoration efforts.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Public scoping under NEPA/CEQA.

Other Comments:

(1) The proposed fish passage facilities would allow striped bass access to the Mokelumne River above Woodbridge, whereas existing facilities do not. This change could increase predation pressure on young salmonids rearing between Woodbridge and Camanche. If, however, the proposed project is successful in eliminating the large plunge pool that now provides ideal habitat for striped bass just below Woodbridge Dam, then the net result of the project could be to reduce striped bass predation pressure on juvenile salmonids. This issue will presumably be addressed in the NMFS Biological Opinion. (2) Of the \$32 million total project cost, some \$12 million is devoted to replacement of the existing flashboard dam with a state-of-the-art adjustable weir dam. The new dam would clearly offer greater operational flexibility than the existing structure, but how much of this added flexibility should be charged to fish passage/habitat improvement (as opposed to improved irrigation flow management) is debatable. Presumably, this debate will take place at the Selection Panel level.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #1

New Proposal Number: 255

New Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

CALFED # 98-B11, USBR # 98-FC-20-16650, Woodbridge Fish Screen Passage Project

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

Reporting, Yes! Record keeping, N/A Financial management, Yes

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Yes, current Agreement completion date is December 31, 2001.

Other Comments:

Woodbridge Irrigation District has completed the final designs and specifications. It is expected that the permits will be acquired in the spring of 2002 as stated by the applicant. Woodbridge ID is very well organized and forthcoming with all of the paper work and reports required under the current Agreement. They have been able to bring stakeholders and interested parties together to arrive at a consensus for each step in development of this project. Job well done so far.

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding: #2

New Proposal Number: 255

New Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

01-N57, Lower Mokelumne River Restoration Program - Phase II, Ecosystem Restoration

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

N/A

3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

Please note, status accurate at time of submitting proposal. Extension has been granted to February 2002.

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

XYes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

Project is scheduled to be complete by February 2002.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 255

Applicant Organization: Woodbridge Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

The applicant must comply with Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act, Although, this may be covered under the Corps permit.

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

-Yes ☒No

If no, please explain:

Money is only allocated for mitigation monitoring for the giant garter snake during construction. No money is allocated for obtaining the proper permits and completing the environmental documents.

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☒Yes -No

If yes, please explain:

If the applicant has funds for obtaining permits, the project is feasible.

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 255

Applicant Organization: Woodbridge Irrigation District

Proposal Title: Woodbridge Fish Passage Improvement Project; Phase 2 & 3

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

XYes -No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

-Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

all information provided in budget summary and justification.